

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/759,036 | 01/11/2001 | Christian Hentschel | PHNL 010002 | 2194 |
| 24737 | 7590 | 09/22/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510 | | | NGUYEN, VAN H | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2126 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/759,036

Applicant(s)

HENTSCHEL ET AL.

Examiner

VAN H NGUYEN

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2126

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Art Unit: 2126

3. Applicant is required to submit a new specification and a statement that indicated no new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 2-10, 12-18, and 20-26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- (i) In claim 1, “and” should be inserted at the end of line 9.
- (ii) “a output” (claim 1, line 8) should read “an output”
- (iii) “an tenth step” (claim 8, lines 1-2) should read “a tenth step”
- (iii) In claim 9, “and” should be inserted at the end of line 4.
- (iv) Dependent claims 2-8 should start with “the method of running the algorithm” as they are referring to “a method of running an algorithm” of independent claim 1.
- (v) Dependent claims 10-13 should start with “the system for running the algorithm” as they are referring to “a system for running an algorithm” of independent claim 9.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2126

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 9-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Webb et al.** (U.S. 6,151,018)

7. As to claim 9, Webb teaches the invention as claimed including a system for running an algorithm wherein the algorithm comprises a first function and a second function (see abstract), the system comprising:

function means conceived to contain the first function of the algorithm and a second function of the algorithm (col.3, line 65-col.4, line 13), and

lookup means (see fig.6) conceived to contain a plurality of output quality levels that can be provided by the algorithm, a first plurality of quality level settings of the first function and a second plurality of quality level settings of the second function (col.3, lines 47-63).

8. As to claim 10, Webb teaches at least one output quality level of the plurality of output quality levels can be provided by the algorithm for at least one first quality level setting of the first plurality of quality level settings and at least one second quality level setting of the second plurality of quality level settings (col.3, lines 30-46).

9. As to claim 11, Webb teaches a complexity means conceived to contain a plurality of levels of complexity of operation for the at least one first quality level setting (col.3, lines 13-22).

10. As to claim 12, Webb teaches a hardware configuration means conceived to contain a hardware platform configuration of the system to determine at least the plurality of output quality

Art Unit: 2126

levels (fig.1 and associated text).

11. As to claim 13, Webb teaches a software configuration means conceived to contain a software platform configuration of the system to determine at least the plurality of output quality levels (col.4, lines 11-19).

12. As to claim 16, Webb teaches a television set (5 and 45, fig.1).

13. As to claim 17, Webb teaches a set-top box (44, fig.1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15. Claims 1-8 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Webb et al.** (U.S. 6,151,018) in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA)**.

Art Unit: 2126

16. As to claim 1, the rejection of claim 9 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Webb further teaches requesting an algorithm resource by the algorithm to provide a plurality of output quality levels (col.4, lines 6-13).

Webb does teach the algorithm, but does not explicitly teach allocating a budget to the algorithm.

APA teaches allocating a budget to the algorithm (page 1, lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of APA with Webb because APA's teachings would have provided the capability for improving video images generated from video signals.

17. As to claim 2, Webb teaches determining that the first function, while providing the first quality level, can be operated at a plurality of levels of complexity (col.3, lines 30-47).

18. As to claim 3, Webb teaches operating the algorithm at the output quality level, and operating the first function at the first quality level while consuming a first amount of resources by the first function and operating the second function at the second quality level while consuming a second amount of resources by the second function (col.4, line 50 - col.5, line 13).

19. As to claim 4, Webb teaches operating the first function at a least complex level of the plurality of levels of complexity (col.3, lines 13-22).

20. As to claim 5, Webb does not explicitly teach the allocated budget is substantially equal to the requested algorithm resource.

APA teaches the allocated budget is substantially equal to the requested algorithm resource (page 1, lines 14-15).

Art Unit: 2126

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of APA with Webb because APA's teachings would have provided the capability for assigning budget or resource for efficiently running the functions.

21. As to claim 6, Webb does not explicitly teach the first amount of resources in addition to the second amount of resources is substantially equal to the allocated budget.

APA teaches first amount of resources in addition to the second amount of resources is substantially equal to the allocated budget (page 1, lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of APA with Webb because APA's teachings would have provided the capability for assigning budget or resource for efficiently running the functions.

22. As to claim 7, Webb teaches determining a hardware platform operating the method to determine the algorithm resource and the plurality of output quality levels (fig. 1 and associated text).

23. As to claim 8, Webb teaches determining a software platform operating the method to determine the algorithm resource and the plurality of output quality levels (col.4, lines 6-13).

24. As to claim 14, Webb teaches a computer program product (col.2, lines 43-50).

25. As to claim 15, Webb teaches a storage device (col.7, lines 4-7).

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Peng (U.S. 6717988) teaches "Scalable MPEG-2 decoder."
- Marchant (U.S. 6240183) teaches "Security apparatus for data transmission with dynamic random encryption."
- Rostoker et al. (U.S. 5872784) teaches "High speed single chip digital video network apparatus."
- Vishwanath et al. (U.S. 5602589) teaches "Video image compression using weighted wavelet hierarchical vector quantization."
- Ding "Rate control of MPEG video coding and recording rate-quantization modeling" 1996 IEEE, pp. 12-20.
- Lee "Rate-distortion optimized frame type selection for MPEG encoding" 1997 IEEE, pp. 501-510.

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. **After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-3765.** The examiner can

Art Unit: 2126

normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VHN


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100